



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

VOLUME XXXVI

APRIL 1920

NUMBER 3

THE SOURCES OF THE CREATION STORY—
GENESIS 1:1—2:4

BY JULIAN MORGENSTERN
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

I

Of all the stories in the Bible none has been studied more diligently and discussed more critically than the story of creation in the opening verses of Genesis. Due to its position at the very beginning of the Bible, to the fundamental religious doctrines which it suggests, and to the so-called controversy between science and religion of the nineteenth century, which, for obvious reasons, centered about it, this story has been subjected to the most minute, scientific analysis. With hardly a dissenting voice modern biblical scholars are agreed that the story, at least in its present literary form, is entirely the work of P.

With surprising unanimity, too, these scholars have agreed that the story, again in its present literary form, is a unit. Practically all admit the interpolation of a few minor glosses, and likewise the transposition or alteration of a few phrases here and there. But almost all biblical scholars today hold that, with these few and unimportant exceptions, the present literary form of the story is very close to the original, and that this was in its entirety the work of one priestly writer or group of writers.

Not quite the same unanimity of opinion obtains in regard to the preliterate sources and history of the story. Again practically all scholars are agreed as to the dependence of the story in its principal details upon the great Babylonian creation myth. But few have carried their investigations into the origins of the biblical creation story beyond this point. Budde¹ has posited the existence of an earlier literary version of the story, the work of J2 writers, which served the later priestly authors as the basis of the story in its present form.

Gunkel² maintains that the Babylonian myth became current in Western Asia at a very early period, and that it was told in Israel from generation to generation. By the time of the early kings the story had become greatly modified, had been gradually divested of its most glaring, and, therefore, from the Israelite standpoint, most objectionable mythological elements, and had adapted itself almost completely to the unmythological and spiritual point of view of Israel's religion. Gradually elements of other traditions, likewise chiefly mythological in character, became fused with the original tradition of Babylonian origin, notably elements of Phoenician and possibly other creation myths, referred to briefly and fragmentarily in 1:2, and the myth of the Golden Age at the beginning of the world, with its implication of the late Jewish eschatological tradition and doctrine that this Golden Age would be restored at the end of time. This composite, but thoroughly fused tradition, after having been current in Israel for many centuries, served the priestly authors as the basis for the present narrative.

Schwally³ holds that the present form of the narrative is the result of the literary fusion of two originally independent and even contradictory versions of the creation story. The one told that God created the universe and all its contents by his word alone, while the other told that God actually worked and made the various creatures, heavenly bodies, monsters, fish, fowl, animals, and man, by his very hands, as it were, in a manner quite similar to the Yahwist account of creation in Genesis, chapter 2. This fundamental difference in the conception of the deity and the nature of his relation to

¹ *Biblische Urgeschichte*.

² *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, and *Genesis*³, pp. 129 f.

³ *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, IX (1906), 159-75.

the universe, coupled with very obvious stylistic differences and internal contradictions, has led Schwally to his conclusion.¹

The correctness of Schwally's main contention cannot be gainsaid.² The conception of a deity so transcendental and spiritual that he creates merely by uttering his divine fiat, "Let such and such be," is radically different from the conception of a deity who makes and fashions things, some of them even in his own image. These two conceptions are theologically too divergent and contradictory to be held by one single writer, or even one group or school of writers.

And, as Schwally has correctly observed, this difference is not merely incidental, but is carried through the entire story consecutively and systematically. Gen. 1:3b is the necessary and indispensable conclusion of verse 3a. The first half of the verse gives the incontrovertible fiat, "Let light be," and the second half tells the corresponding result, "And light was."³ Without the intervention of any physical or even non-physical act of construction, that which is commanded by God immediately comes to be. There is no mediation nor conditioning of any kind at all; the divine word once spoken, the thing commanded immediately is. Just this is the thought of the oft-repeated *וַיְהִי כֵן*. It is not a mere stylistic phrase, the presence or absence of which was altogether optional with the authors, and therefore of little or no significance. It parallels completely the thought of *וַיְהִי אֹרֶךְ* of Gen. 1:3, and is in every case the equally essential and indispensable corollary and conclusion to the divine fiat, "Let such and such become (i.e., 'come into being'; in German *werden* rather than *sein*); and so it became." Accordingly there can be no question that in 1:20 we must, following the Septuagint, supply *וַיְהִי כֵן*, omitted in the Masoretic Text,⁴ and

¹ Of the other commentators, Ilgen (*Die Urkunde des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs*) has gone farthest in analysis and emendation of the text of the creation story (cf. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*³, pp. 184 f.). But his conclusions, based almost entirely upon LXX, deal mainly with questions of textual glosses and changes rather than with those of sources and versions.

² Gunkel (*Genesis*³, p. 119) makes a passing allusion to Schwally's article, but seems not to have taken pains to understand it thoroughly and to evaluate it correctly. This is all the more regrettable, for, with Gunkel's characteristic methods of investigation the hint which Schwally's suggestive paper gave might well have led to valuable results.

³ This rendering, "Let light be, and light was," reproduces the obvious thought of the original much better than the customary rendering in English, "Let there be light, and there was light."

⁴ So also Gunkel and others.

that, likewise with the Septuagint, **וַיְהִי כֵן** in the Masoretic Text at the close of 1:7 should actually come at the close of 1:6,¹ and also that **וַיְהִי כֵן** of 1:30 in the Masoretic Text is not in its original position or context.²

But since this is the obvious, indisputable meaning of **וַיְהִי כֵן**, it follows that all the passages which state, usually in considerable detail and with characteristic verbosity, that God made the various objects of creation, and generally follow immediately after **וַיְהִי כֵן**, cannot be regarded as amplificatory of **וַיְהִי כֵן** (to be translated "so God made" rather than "and God made"), but must be altogether tautological and contradictory. Either they emanate from some originally independent version of the creation story, as Schwally contends, or they are the product of a far-reaching, systematic revision and amplification of the original, simple creation story, based not upon an independent and in many details divergent version, but upon pure theological speculation.

From this it becomes clear that **וַיְהִי כֵן** of Gen. 1:7b is not really out of place, as most biblical scholars maintain, and should therefore be transposed to follow immediately after 1:6 and to precede 1:7a, but that the whole of 1:7a is an interpolation of these late theological editors, unskillfully inserted, at least in the Masoretic Text, in the wrong place, before the original **וַיְהִי כֵן** instead of after it as usual, as for instance in 1:15 ff. and 1:24 ff. It follows, likewise, that in the original version of the creation story **וַיְהִי כֵן** stood after 1:20, and was ultimately suppressed, at least in the Masoretic Text, by the redactors who inserted 1:21. In these two cases at least the Septuagint is closer to the original than the Masoretic Text.

Schwally unfortunately pursued this line of reasoning no farther than this, or he might have arrived at conclusions even more significant and positive. Instead he diverged here, and finally arrived at the unfounded and rather grotesque hypothesis of the existence in ancient Israel of a tradition that man had been originally created by God with a bisexual nature.³

Careful consideration of the facts thus far established leads to a conclusion of far-reaching significance. In the first place, it must

Cf. below, this page; likewise most of the commentators. 'Cf. below, p. 189.

³ For a refutation of this hypothesis cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*³, p. 113; Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 33, and below, p. 189.

be inferred that all those passages which speak of God making any of his creatures, whether designated by the verbs **עשה** or **ברא**,¹ cannot have been originally parts of the version which told that God brought these things into being by his word alone, and which must have closed in each case with **ויהי כן** or some similar expression, as **ויהי אור**. This fact immediately excludes from what we may call the "divine-fiat" version, Gen. 1:7a, 12a, 16–18a, 21abab, 25a, while, as Schwally has correctly observed, 1:26–30, recounting the creation of man, contain so much material that is obviously from what we may tentatively call the "making" version, that it is almost impossible to tell how the "divine-fiat" version of the creation of man may have read.²

But more than this; 2:1 forms the obvious, natural, and logical conclusion of the actual creation story, particularly in the "divine-fiat" version.³ Gen. 2:2 and 3 tell of the institution of the Sabbath. In addition to the oft-discussed difficulty of the syntactical connection of **ויכל** at the beginning of 2:2 with what precedes, and of the use of **השביעי** in 2:2a instead of **הששי**, as might be expected,⁴ one fact stands out so glaringly apparent that it is almost inexplicable that it was not perceived by scholars long before this. Gen. 2:2 and 3 state, with most punctilious and significant repetition and exactness, that God completed (or had completed) on the seventh day his work (**מלאכתו**; always used of physical activities or material undertakings) which he had made (**עשה**), and so on the seventh day he ceased (or rested) from all his work (**מלאכתו**) which he had made (**עשה**); therefore God blessed the seventh day and declared it a holy institution, because on it he had ceased (or rested) from all his work (**מלאכתו**) which God had created (**ברא**) by (?) making (**לעשות**).⁵

¹ For **ברא** cf. below, pp. 201 f.

² Cf. also the use of the term "made" in Jubilees, chap. 2.

³ So already Ilgen.

⁴ So LXX; cf. also Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*³, pp. 185 f.

⁵ An attractive conjecture, made by a friend and former pupil, Rabbi Abba H. Silver, of Cleveland, Ohio, accounts very plausibly for the difficult **אלהים לעשות** at the end of 2:3. Certainly **אלהים** here is awkward and redundant, while **לעשות** is syntactically objectionable, if not impossible. No intelligent person would think, much less write, in any language in this manner. The sentence is obviously finished with the verb **ברא**. Rabbi Silver calls attention to the fact that **עשות** is used again in 2:4, and is followed immediately by **יהוה אלהים**. This is the first time this peculiar and very uncommon combination of these two names of the deity is used in the Bible, and this fact may well have seemed to some ancient student to demand explanation. Unless he knew that

Leaving out of consideration, for the present, the question of the possibility of glossation and redactorial emendation in these verses, one fact forces itself upon our notice. The Sabbath is instituted because upon it God ceased from his work of creation. The Sabbath is instituted as a day of physical rest and abstention from physical labor by man, because on it God ceased, and therefore rested, from his physical labors in making the universe. This idea is expressed even more concretely and crassly in the priestly addition to the so-called fourth commandment (Exod. 20:11), which states that God rested in the physical sense (נִירָה), and in the priestly addition to the Holiness-Code-Sabbath injunction in Exod. 31:17b, which says that in six days God made (עָשָׂה) heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested (שָׁבַת) and refreshed himself (וַיִּנְפֹּשׁ). In other words, a tradition current in certain sections or at a certain period of the priestly school told that God had labored physically to make the world, that this physical labor had endured for six days, that thereby God had wearied, or even exhausted, himself, and so on the seventh day he desisted from his labor,¹ and rested and refreshed himself. Therefore, because man, too, would have to labor, and, created presumably in God's own image and likeness, would also become weary and exhausted, and would need rest and bodily refreshment, God instituted the Sabbath, so that on it man, too, might rest even as he, God, rested.²

From all this, however, it follows necessarily that the whole Sabbath idea, based upon the thought of God's physical labor, exhaustion, and need of bodily rest and reinvigoration, is altogether out of harmony with, and contradictory to, the "divine-fiat" version of the creation story, which told that, absolutely without physical exertion and wearisome labor, God merely spoke his word and the thing commanded came into being. In other words, the whole

יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים was a compound term, he might construe יְהוָה alone as standing in the construct relation with עֲשָׂה, and אֱלֹהִים as the object of עֲשָׂה. To guard against this possible misunderstanding, a marginal gloss was made, אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשָׂה, i.e., אֱלֹהִים, too, belongs to עֲשָׂה in the construct relation. For a time this stood in the margin, but eventually it crept into the text, and that in a strange position at the end of 2:3.

¹ Cf. the wording of 2:2b.

² The implication here seems to be that the Sabbath is instituted, not because God had rested once, immediately after creation, on that day, but because God still keeps the Sabbath and abstains from work on it.

Sabbath idea, and with it 2:2 and 3, cannot be a part of the "divine fiat" version of the creation narrative, but must be an integral part of the "making" version, or, as it may now be called more appropriately and significantly, the "Sabbath" version. For the idea of the institution of the Sabbath already at creation obviously constitutes the fundamental theme and *raison d'être* of this version with its various interpolations noted above.¹

But even more than this; scholars have long recognized that the account of creation in eight successive acts, or rather, by eight divine commands, fits but poorly into the scheme of creation in six days. To achieve this end the stages of creation have been so distributed that on the third and sixth days each there are two creative processes instead of only one, as on the remaining four days. This arrangement is manifestly artificial. Therefore scholars have agreed quite generally that the limitation of the creation to six days is a secondary element of the story, unknown to the original. This told only that the universe was created in eight or possibly nine,² stages, each marked by a separate divine command. The later modification of the original story by the insertion of the six-day motif was merely to prepare the way for the institution of the Sabbath upon the seventh day.

From this alone scholars might have inferred, had they been so inclined, that the Sabbath element is secondary in the creation story. But somehow they seem never to have drawn this conclusion. Our investigation thus far has established this fact beyond all possibility of doubt; and not this alone, but also, if the Sabbath motif be not

¹ This settles the oft-disputed question of the syntactical construction of וַיְכַל in 2:2. Inasmuch as it introduces the secondary sentence, which, in relation to the system of numbering the days of creation (cf. below, p. 176), seeks to account for the institution of the Sabbath upon the seventh day, and is unquestionably not a part of the main narrative, no construction is possible other than to regard it as a pluperfect, and translate, "Now God had completed on (or better, 'by') the seventh day," etc.

Unquestionably the original "divine fiat" version used the impersonal passive וַיֵּבְרָא in 2:1 purposely, to carry out its central idea that the various things created came into being automatically through the divine word alone, without any physical intervention or constructive activity on the part of the deity. On the other hand, the active וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים of 2:2 implies just that very positive, physical, creative activity on the part of the deity which is characteristic of the "Sabbath" version.

Attention may likewise be called in passing to the fact that וַיְבַרֵךְ in 2:3 is used in a sense almost synonymous with וַיְקַדֵּשׁ, and quite different from the meaning of וַיְבַרֵךְ in 1:22 and 28 (cf. below, p. 188).

² The creation of fish and birds on the fifth day (1:20-23) was probably also originally recounted as two separate creative acts; cf. below, p. 186.

an integral part of the original creation story, and if the arrangement of the processes of creation into the scheme of a six-day period be merely preparatory to the Sabbath law, it follows that the six-day scheme is likewise secondary, and that, therefore, all those passages which refer to the six days must be secondary. Consequently we must exclude from the original narrative 1:5*b*, 8*b*, 13, 19, 23, and 31*b*.¹

¹ This conclusion relieves one difficulty in the interpretation of Genesis, chap. 1 which has always troubled biblical scholars. They have repeatedly called attention to the fact that, just as 1:2*a* states explicitly, so the fact that light is said to have been created first would imply that previously there had been only darkness. Existence, therefore, began with the emanation of light out of darkness. It would, accordingly, have been natural and logical to regard the day as beginning with morning, and to have reckoned the day from sunrise to sunrise, instead of from sunset to sunset, as is obviously implied in the oft-repeated formula, "And it was evening, and it was morning, . . . day," and as was the practice in later Judaism.

In earlier Jewish practice, however, as late as the time of the secondary strata of the Priestly Code, it seems to have been customary to reckon the day from sunrise to sunrise, or, rather, from dawn to dawn. Thus the law for the "praise-offering" (Lev. 7:17 [Pt]) specifies that this sacrifice must be eaten on the day upon which it is offered, and that nothing may be left until morning. The repetition of the law in Lev. 22:30 (perhaps Holiness Code, but more likely either P2 or RP; cf. Baentsch and Bertholet) is even more explicit: "On that very day (when it was sacrificed) it shall be eaten; ye shall not leave anything of it until morning. Clearly the next morning is here reckoned as belonging to the next day, and not the same day as the preceding evening and night. In other words, the day is reckoned here from sunrise to sunrise.

Likewise in Exod. 16:19 f. (according to Bacon, Holzinger, and Kittel, JE; according to Baentsch, Carpenter, Cornill, Dillmann, Driver, and Kuenen, P; according to Wellhausen, partly JE and partly P) the manna was given to the people in the morning, just at dawn and before the sun had become warm (16:21). It was to be eaten only on the day upon which it was gathered; nothing was to remain over until the next morning; that which did so remain became foul. Here, too, the day seems to have been reckoned from dawn to dawn. This, too, seems to be the implication of Is. 21:12, where the morning is represented as preceding the night. (Cf., likewise, the very common expression *ירמם ולילה*.)

Of even greater significance is the Passover legislation in the Bible. Lev. 23:5 f. states explicitly that the paschal lamb shall be sacrificed and the actual Passover celebration shall be held during the night of the 14th of the first month. But the celebration of the *Maggoth* festival, as distinct from the Passover, begins only the next morning, and the 15th of the first month, and not the night of the 14th, is counted as the first day of the *Maggoth* festival. This, too, is the explicit statement of Num. 28:16 f.

Similarly, the Passover legislation of Deut. 16:1-8 prescribes that the paschal lamb shall be sacrificed at the central sanctuary in the evening, and shall be eaten during that night; nothing may remain over until morning. In the morning the people shall return to their homes, there to celebrate the *Maggoth* festival for seven days. Here, too, apparently, the celebration of the *Maggoth* festival, as distinct from the Passover, and with it the reckoning of the seven days, seems to begin with the morning. (In this case *ביום הראשון* in Deut. 16:4*b*, and probably also *בערב* would be a gloss, or the conscious insertion of some late writer, who followed the later practice of reckoning the day from sunset to sunset, and so regarded the night of the Passover celebration as the beginning of the first day of the composite Passover-*Maggoth* festival (so Bertholet, p. 51; also Steuernagel, pp. 59 f.). He was probably the same man as the late author of Exod. 12:18 or stood under his immediate influence (cf. below).

The Passover legislation in Exodus, chap. 12, provides that the paschal lamb, carefully selected on the 10th day of the first month, shall be slaughtered just at twilight (*בין הערבים*; cf. the *כבוא השמש* of Deut. 16:6, and the difference of interpretation of

The question of the primary or secondary character of the recurrent expression, **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב**, is somewhat more difficult. It occurs in the Masoretic Text after every creative act except the creation of the heavens (1:4a, 10b, 12b, 18b, 21bγ, 25b, 31a [expanded form]). Its omission in 1:8 is surprising and inexplicable; and since LXX reads it there, the expression stood in all likelihood in 1:8 also in the original text. In 1:4 the expression seems out of place. Since the name of an object was regarded by the ancient Semites as an integral part of that object, and, therefore, the giving of the names to the created things was an essential, and the logical concluding step in their creation, it is surprising to find **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב** in 1:4a intervening between the creative steps of 3 and 4b-5.

this first expression of Rashi and Ibn Ezra) of the 14th, and eaten during the same night; nothing may remain over until morning. Likewise, all leaven shall be removed from the homes, and only *maṣṣoth* shall be eaten during the ensuing seven days. This period extends from the evening of the 14th of the first month to the evening of the 21st (12:18). The eating of the *maṣṣoth*, and with this, of course, the entire festival celebration, terminate at sunset of the 21st, i.e., at the moment which ushers in the 21st day of the month. Upon the first and seventh days of the festival, i.e., impliedly, upon the 14th and 20th of the month, respectively, there is to be a *miqra' qodeš* (for the exact meaning of this technical term, cf. a paper of mine, "Two Compound Technical Terms of Biblical Hebrew," to appear in the forthcoming *Memorial Volume in Honor of Alexander Kohut*) with its attendant interdict of work.

This legislation differs radically from that in the three passages already considered, in that it fixes the period for the eating of the *maṣṣoth* from the evening of the 14th to the evening of the 21st, instead of from the morning of the 15th to the morning of the 22d. Clearly, to the authors of Exod. 12:18 the day was reckoned from sunset to sunset. But that this fixing of the period of eating the *maṣṣoth*, and with it, the change in the system of reckoning the day, were innovations with these writers, may be inferred from the punctiliousness with which they state twice that the period in question begins in the evening and likewise ends at evening.

Practically all scholars are agreed that both Exod. 12:14-20 and Num. 28:16 ff. are the work of secondary priestly writers. Baentsch goes even farther, and assigns Exod. 12:18-20 to Pss., i.e., to a priestly writer who wrote, apparently, even later than the author of Num. 28:16 f. In this Baentsch is unquestionably correct, as our previous discussion shows. But this points to the conclusion that this change in the system of reckoning the day from sunset to sunset instead of from dawn to dawn, took place at a comparatively late date in the period of priestly legislation and literary composition.

Corroborating this is the legislation for Yom Kippur in Lev. 23:26-32, likewise the work of secondary priestly writers. This provides that on the 10th day of the seventh month a solemn fast day shall be observed. Verse 32 expressly provides that the fasting shall begin on the 9th day of the month at evening, and continue from evening until evening, i.e., the evening of the 10th. It is clear that traces of a double system of reckoning the day are present here. The fast is celebrated only on the 10th of the month (vs. 26), and from evening to evening, i.e., the day begins here at sunset. This is the later system of reckoning, as we have seen above, just as, also, it is admitted by practically all biblical scholars, Yom Kippur is a late institution in the Jewish religious calendar, the product of the period after Ezra, and the work of late priestly legislators. But a trace of the older system of reckoning the day is to be seen in the statement that the moment when the fast begins, which, according to the later system, would be already a part of the 10th day, is here called the 9th at evening. Likewise the punctiliousness

In every other case **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב** follows the incident of the giving of the name, just as we expect. Accordingly there can be little doubt that **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב** in 4a has been inserted in the wrong place, and that this fact probably indicates the hand of a reviser.

Moreover, the language of 1:31, where **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב** is coupled with the verb **עָשָׂה**, might indicate that the expression is rather a part of the "Sabbath" version of the creation story than of the "divine fiat" version.

This inference is corroborated by one very significant consideration. The thought of **וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב** implies the possibility that the things created by God might not have turned out good. Not

with which the priestly authors state that the fasting is to begin at the evening of the 9th and continue from evening to evening, parallels the similar statement in Exod. 12:18, and points to the same conclusion, that the priestly authors knew perfectly well that they were dealing with an innovation in thus reckoning the day from evening to evening, and therefore felt the need of expressing themselves so exactly. (Possibly a similar conclusion may be drawn from the statement of Esther 4:16, that the people are to fast for three days, night and day. Certainly the day is here reckoned from sunset.)

From Matt. 28:1 it may be inferred that the practice of reckoning the day from sunset to sunset was not universal in Israel, but in certain circles the older practice continued for several centuries. There it is explicitly stated that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to the tomb of Jesus late on the Sabbath day, just as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week. Inasmuch as these last moments of the night, just preceding the dawn, are called "late on the Sabbath day," and the first day of the week does not begin until dawn, it is manifest that the day is still reckoned here from dawn to dawn. This is also the implication of the parallel passage, Mark 16:1 f., "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, they came to the tomb when the sun was risen." Luke 23:56b—24:1 seems to imply the same; "And on the Sabbath day they rested according to the commandment. But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb." (On the other hand, the parallel passage in John 20:1 seems to imply the later system of reckoning the day from sunset to sunset: "Now on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, while it was yet dark." Here the hours of the night, before dawn, seem to be reckoned to the first day of the week, i.e., the day must have been counted from the preceding sunset.)

Finally, it is significant that in the second Temple, throughout its entire existence, the practice seems to have been in all ritual matters to reckon the day from dawn to dawn, and not according to the later practice, from sunset to sunset. The procedure of the Temple was conservative, and held fast to the older practice, even after the new system had come into vogue in profane life. At any rate, this seems to be the only possible meaning of the rabbinical dictum, **בְּקֻדְשִׁים לַיְלָה הוֹלֵךְ אַחֲרֵי הַיּוֹם** (*Hullin* 83a). According to Rashi, this principle is based upon the legislation for the praise-offering in Lev. 7:15. In other words, even the rabbis, who, themselves, reckoned the day from sunset to sunset, and refused to admit the legitimacy of any other practice, or rather, absolutely ignored all divergent practice, none the less had to admit the validity of the interpretation of Lev. 7:15, which we have given, and with it the fact that, at least in ritual matters, the day was at one time reckoned from sunrise to sunrise.

From this it is clear that at different periods in Israel's history two distinct systems of reckoning the day obtained. The earlier practice, which continued until the time of the secondary strata of the Priestly Code, was to reckon the day from dawn to dawn. This seems to be the idea underlying the motif of the "divine fiat" version of the creation

until after the thing is completely made and the name given to it is it examined by God critically and pronounced good. The procedure is comparable to that of a workman who surveys the finished product of his hands and tools and pronounces it either perfect or imperfect. It reminds particularly of the primitive Yahwistic creation story in Genesis, chapter 2, where God, working as a potter, makes the various animals, one after the other, to be the complete mates of man, but finds after each creative act that he has not achieved his purpose, in other words, that his work has not been good.¹ This idea of the possibility of failure, however, accords not at all with the conception of a deity so transcendental and spiritual that physical attributes may not be ascribed to him, and who creates, not by making and fashioning, but by merely uttering his divine fiat. Such a word must of necessity be conceived of as infallible, with no possibility of the slightest failure, error, or deviation from perfection, and with no need of critical appraisal at the end, before the thing thus created can be pronounced good. We may, therefore, infer with quite reasonable certainty that this entire *יִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים כִּי טוֹב* motif, and with it 1:4a (LXX, 8ba), 10b, 12b, 18b, 21bγ, 25b, and 31a,

story that light was the first thing created. The later practice was to reckon the day from sunset to sunset. This is the implication of the secondary "Sabbath" version of the creation story. By thus distinguishing between these two strata of the creation story, this difficulty is obviated.

It is impossible to tell exactly when this change in the mode of reckoning the day took place in Israel, and what causes brought it about. Possibly it may have had something to do with the introduction of the lunar calendar instead of the solar, for a lunar calendar naturally presupposes a reckoning of the day from nightfall to nightfall. Certainly this change was introduced later than the composition of Pt, Pg, and even some of the secondary portions of P. It was probably coincident with the revision of the festival calendar, which took place in the period after the time of Ezra, and was, in all probability, the work of the Soferim or of the Great Synod in the fourth century B.C. This may also be inferred from the statement in the Talmud (*Berachoth* 33a) that the men of the Great Synod instituted the ceremonies of Kiddush and Havdalah, the solemn sanctification of the Sabbath on Friday eve, and its equally solemn ushering out on Saturday eve, in other words, ceremonies specifically marking the beginning and close of the Sabbath as at sunset. These were ceremonies for the Jewish home instead of the Temple. This, coupled with the fact that in the second Temple the old system of reckoning the day from dawn to dawn continued to be observed, as we have seen, may perhaps indicate that this entire innovation was the work of an anti-priestly group or party in the Great Synod (cf. below, p. 209).

For many of these references and the suggestion of their implication I am indebted to the courtesy of my friend and colleague, Professor Jacob Z. Lauterbach, who kindly put at my disposal an unpublished paper of his dealing with the entire subject of the Jewish calendar.

¹ Cf. my "The Sources of the Paradise Story" in *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, I (1919), 105-23 and 225-40.

belong, not to the "divine-fiat" version of the creation story, but to the "Sabbath" version.

Moreover, it is perfectly clear by this time that the "divine-fiat" version is the original form of the creation story, and that the "Sabbath" version is secondary. We have noted that occasionally insertions from the "Sabbath" version disturb the context and logical continuity of the main narrative, as, for example, **וַיְרֵא אֱלֹהִים** **וַיֵּשֶׁב** in 1:4a, and 7a preceding, instead of following, 7b. Furthermore all the **וַיֵּשֶׁב** passages are unnecessarily repetitive of, and at the same time contradictory in fact, as they are invariably in spirit, of the thought expressed in the words **וַיְהִי כֵן**. No other conclusion is possible, therefore, than that the "Sabbath" version is secondary to the original "divine-fiat" version.

In fact it may be doubted whether there ever was an actual independent "Sabbath" version of the creation story, as Schwally maintains, constituting originally a separate and complete version in itself. It seems rather that all the passages which we have thus far had reason to assign to this so-called "Sabbath" version bear all the earmarks of systematic amplifications, from a clearly defined theological standpoint, of the original, simple "divine-fiat" creation story. However, this question can be answered finally and with certainty only when we shall have completed our detailed analysis of the creation story. For the present we shall continue to use the term "Sabbath" version as a matter of convenience, to designate the secondary insertions into the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story.

II

We have thus far had reason to assign to this secondary "Sabbath" version the following verses: 1:4a, 5b, 7a, 8b, 10b, 12, 13, 16-19, 21, 23, 25, 31; 2:2, 3. Moreover, it is apparent that in 1:26-30, the account of the creation of man, there is considerable secondary material, the exact extent and nature of which can be determined only by a more minute examination than we have thus far had opportunity to make.

On the other hand, the essential details and the general form of the original "divine-fiat" version are readily apparent. They are most definitely presented in 1:9-10a, where no secondary material

has crept in to disturb the continuity and obscure the characteristic thought. This original version was couched seemingly in a logical and recurrent formula, ——— וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי (or the appropriate verb), then וַיְהִי כֵן, and finally ——— וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לֵ—. Moreover, when first referring to something about to be called into existence, but which has not yet received its specific name, this original version used only some general descriptive term. But after it had told of the giving of the specific name, it used only that name thereafter and systematically refrained from using the first general, descriptive term, or any other name or title; thus the use of אֹר and יוֹם in 1:3 and 5, שָׁמַיִם and רָקִיעַ in 1:6, 8, and 9, and יַבְשָׁה and אֶרֶץ in 1:9 and 10a.

Accordingly, we may unhesitatingly assign to this original version 1:3, 4b, 5a, 6, 7b, 8a, 9, 10a, 11 (in its original form), 14–15 (in their original form), 20 (in its original form), 24 (in its original form), the original account of the creation of man, now buried in 1:26–30, and 2:1. For the present 1:1, 2, 22, and 2:4 may be regarded as doubtful. Our main task from now on is to determine definitely whether these four verses are original or secondary, and also the original form of 1:11, 14–15, 20, 24, and 26–30.

Passing over for the present 1:1 and 2, and considering only those verses assigned above to the "divine-flat" version in our endeavor to reconstruct the original text as far as possible, we note that in 1:9, for the מָקוֹם of the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint reads מְקוֹה. In the light of the מְקוֹה הַמַּיִם of 1:10 and the further LXX gloss at the end of 1:9, מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם, וַיִּקְרָא הַמַּיִם וַיִּבְרָא הַיַּבְשָׁה, where מְקוֹה is referred to again, and, finally, in the light of what we have noted above regarding the characteristic use of general, descriptive terms before the final giving of the specific name,¹ we may regard מְקוֹה as the more probable original reading.

Gen. 1:11a has manifestly been re-worked, and this to a far greater extent than is admitted by most biblical scholars, who

¹ That the above-mentioned addition of LXX at the end of 1:9 is a gloss, and not a part of the original text, lost in the Masoretic Text, is patent from the fact that it uses the plural, מְקוֹהִים, whereas the original used the singular, מְקוֹה אחד, as well as from the redundancy in comparison with וַיְהִי כֵן at the end of 1:9 in the Massoretic Text, characteristic of the secondary "Sabbath" version and glosses.

would do no more than omit פרי after עץ, and also, following LXX, read ויעץ,¹ and also omit למיני.² In their present form the words following דשא appear like a gloss defining that seemingly comparatively uncommon word. But actually דשא, while not used in the Bible nearly as frequently as either עשב or עץ, is by no means so uncommon that it requires such definition. Moreover, careful study of the verse makes one thing clear, viz., that דשא is a general, descriptive term, used by the author in his characteristic manner to designate all plant life, and that עשב and עץ are the specific terms later employed by him (cf. 1:29) to designate the two classes or species into which he divided all vegetation, and bearing exactly the same relation to דשא as שמים bears to רקיע in 1:6 and 8a, or ארץ bears to יבשה in 1:9 and 10.

Furthermore, we miss what, we have seen, was a necessary and indispensable element of the original creation story, viz., the giving of the name or names. We shall have convincing proof later that the editors of the original creation story did not merely insert the "Sabbath" passages into the original text, but took even greater liberties of omission and alteration, and, in one particular case, in connection with the account of the creation of man, even deliberately removed from its original place to an altogether unnatural position in 5:2bβ, and modified considerably in so doing, the account of God's giving the name אדם to man. Finally, it is to be noted that in the continuation of the narrative, the original author, in his characteristic manner, did not use the general, descriptive term דשא again, but only the specific and technical עשב and עץ. Therefore we are justified in inferring that the original creation story told that God distinguished between the two obvious forms of vegetation, plants and trees, and the one he called עשב and the other עץ. Naturally we are in no position to determine the actual basis of this differentiation and classification, and the consequent exact reading of the original.

It is likewise doubtful whether the original text read תרשא. The verb is exceedingly rare, found elsewhere in the Bible only in

¹ So Ball, Gunkel, and others.

² So Gunkel. על-הארץ at the end of 1:11a is particularly difficult. It is impossible to construe the clause תרשא הארץ . . . על הארץ, but it is equally impossible to regard the phrase as modifying מזריע and עשה or any other words in the clause.

Joel 2:22, where it is used in the *Qal*, a use that would be more natural here than the *Hiph'il*. While the original author used **דשא** as a general, descriptive term, the use of a verb from this same stem was in no wise necessitated thereby. Moreover, the interpolation of the "Sabbath" version in 1:12, naturally largely dependent upon the original wording, has **ותוצא**, a reading difficult to explain, had the original read **חדשא**. And finally, 1:24, a part of the original creation story, reads **ותוצא הארץ** in the account of the creation of animals.¹ In the light of all this, and in view of the fact that the change or gradual corruption of **תוצא** to **חדשא** is simple and easily made, we may safely infer that the original reading was **תוצא**.² Accordingly we would reconstruct the original text of 1:11-13 as follows: **ויאמר אלהים תוצא הארץ דשא ויהי כן: ויבדל אלהים בין הדשא ה— ובין חדשא ה—: ויקרא אלהים לדשא ה— עשב ולדשא ה— קרא עץ:**

The account of the creation of the heavenly bodies in 1:14-19 occasions even greater difficulties. We have already concluded for sufficient reasons that 1:16-19 are secondary. In addition to the facts already cited which point to this conclusion, we may call attention in passing to several corroborative facts. Gen. 1:17, which states that God put the heavenly bodies in the firmament of heaven, contradicts 1:14, which states that God commanded not only that they come into being, but also that they come into being immediately in their proper places in heaven. This would require no second act on the part of the deity after they were once made, of putting them into their appointed positions. In other words, the idea of an additional act and of the attendant physical exertion implied in **ויתן** is on a par with that of **ויעש**, and is altogether contradictory of the underlying thought of the "divine-fiat" version.

Moreover, it is significant that 1:18 uses the terms **אור** and **השך**, whereas 1:14 uses **יום** and **לילה**. Inasmuch as the original "divine-fiat" version, as we have already noted, first uses general,

¹ In other words, as Gunkel has pointed out (*Genesis*³, p. 110), the author of the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story, either consciously or unconsciously, embodied in his presentation something of the conception of the earth as the great mother and source of all life (cf. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*), current among the Semites from the very earliest times. (Cf. Nöldeke, "Mutter Erde und Verwandtes bei den Semiten," *ARW*, VIII [1905], 161-67.)

² So also Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, I, to the passage.

descriptive terms for the things created, but, after the specific names have been given to these objects, refers to them only by these specific, and never by the general, names, we cannot but regard the uncalled-for reversion to the general terms אור and חשך in 1:18 as indicative of a late hand.

Even with these verses out of the way, however, 1:14 and 15 present considerable difficulties. Skinner has remarked that these are the only verses in the entire creation story in which the specific purpose of any of the things created is mentioned. This is not quite correct, for 1:6 states explicitly that the heaven was created in order to separate the waters above from those below, and 1:26 implies apparently that man was created in order to have dominion over the lower creatures. Therefore it is not the fact that the purpose of the creation of the heavenly bodies is mentioned that is significant, but rather the direct and bald manner in which this purpose is expressed through the use of the infinitive with ל. By analogy with 1:6 and 26 we would expect מברילים (והיו) or ויהיו or ויברילו, rather than the present להבריל. The use of the infinitive here is somewhat suspicious.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that, whereas 1:16-18 are unduly repetitious and enlarge upon the functions of the heavenly bodies in altogether superfluous manner, they make no further mention at all of the particular purpose stated in 1:14b, viz., to serve as portents and to mark days, years, and festival seasons. The probability is great that 1:14b is a very late insertion into the text, interpolated after the addition of 1:16-19 had been made. This is confirmed by the fact that Sam. and LXX have an even fuller text for 1:14 than the Masoretic Text. After להאיר על הארץ Sam. reads להאיר על הארץ שמים, while in addition to this LXX reads ולמשל ביום ובלילה. The fact that both Sam. and LXX read להאיר על הארץ shows that this is no accidental nor individual emendation, but that it must have stood in the text of certain early manuscripts, from which those two versions were made.

Returning to 1:14aβ, a moment's consideration shows that the thought here expressed is altogether superfluous, and even contradictory of 1:4 and 5. There it was stated explicitly that God distinguished between light and darkness, and called the former day

and the latter night. In other words, the distinction between day and night was already sufficiently made, and there was no need nor occasion for further distinction. Nor could such distinction between day and night be conceived of in any way as the primary purpose of the existence of the sun and moon, as the present position of 1:14a β in relation to the other functions of the heavenly bodies, stated later, seems to imply. Nor would it be an altogether satisfactory means of making this distinction, for the ancients knew perfectly well that quite frequently the moon is visible even during the day.

Furthermore, the opening words of 1:15 are suspiciously tautological. The awkward and meaningless repetition of *למאורת* has always seemed objectionable to scholars, and has, accordingly, been pronounced a gloss by Stade and Gunkel. But in addition to this, 1:14a α stated sufficiently that the heavenly bodies were to have their fixed place in the firmament, and the repetition of the thought here is weakening and suspicious.

In view of all this the conclusion forces itself upon one that 1:14a $\beta\beta$ and 15a α are interpolations into the original text, of the same nature entirely as the additional glosses in Sam. and LXX.

Inasmuch as the text uses *רקיע* in 1:6 to designate in a general and descriptive way what is in 1:8 given the specific name *שמים*, the use of *רקיע* in 1:14 and again in 1:19 in connection with *שמים* is suspicious; and inasmuch as the same compound expression is used twice in the interpolated passages, 1:15a and 17, the insertion of *רקיע* in 1:14a and 19 is probably the work of this interpolator.

Likewise, in view of the fact stated above, that the use of the infinitive to express baldly the purpose for which the heavenly bodies were made is unnatural here, and therefore suspicious, the likelihood is great that the original text read simply *ויאיר* instead of *להאיר*. Certainly to give light must have seemed to the ancients the primary function of the heavenly bodies, and this is in fact implied by the position of *על-הארץ* in Sam. and LXX of 1:14 and also in the Masoretic Text of 1:17.¹ We may therefore conclude that the original account of the creation of the

¹ Cf. also Jubilees 2:8.

heavenly bodies read simply, **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי מֵאֲרוֹת בַּשָּׁמַיִם**, **וַיֵּאֲדָרוּ עַל-הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי כֵן**; **וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לַמָּאֹר הַגָּדֹל שֶׁמֶשׁ וּלְמָאֹר הַקָּטָן קֶרֶב יָרֵחַ**. This was probably followed by the customary **וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לַמָּאֹר הַגָּדֹל שֶׁמֶשׁ וּלְמָאֹר הַקָּטָן קֶרֶב יָרֵחַ**. Whether the original made any reference to the stars, as in 1:17, is problematical.¹

In the account of the creation on the fifth day we have already assigned 1:21 and 23 to the secondary "Sabbath" version of the creation story. Our primary concern, therefore, is with 1:20 and 22. Scholars have long held that the association of birds with marine creatures here is unnatural and suspicious and points to the conclusion that the original story told of their creation separately as two distinct stages of the creative process, and that their fusion is due to the desire to compress the various stages of creation into the six-day scheme. Consideration of 1:22 corroborates this conclusion. Gen. 1:22*ba* employs the imperative, 2d person plural, i.e., the marine creatures are addressed directly, . . . **פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ** (cf. 1:28). The import of this "blessing" is clear. It is not a mere beneficent wish, but a creative process essential to the completion of creation. It bestows upon the creatures to which it is addressed the power of self-propagation; without it life would have had no perpetuity, and the purpose of creation would have been frustrated. Such being the case, it becomes immediately apparent that 1:22*bβ*, addressed to the birds in the 3d person, with only one verb employed, instead of the customary three, and that verb in the jussive instead of the imperative, betrays the hand of the redactor, probably the writer

¹ It might be argued that instead of solving the problem of the apparent contradiction between the creation of light as the first command of God, and the creation of the heavenly bodies now, in order to give light upon the earth, this reduction of 1:14-19 to their original form but makes the problem all the more acute. Actually, however, this is not the case. While more clearly perceived, it is true, the problem of this apparent contradiction is not one whit altered from what it was before. And the customary solution of biblical scholars is most probably correct, that the mention of light as the first thing created is due entirely to the mythological antecedents of the story. Certainly in post-exilic Israel two kinds of light were distinguished between, the light emanating from the sun, and another, unearthly, transcendental light, more intimately associated with the deity; cf. Dan. 2:22, and the flame which emanates from the *kebhod* *Yahwe*, Exod. 25:17; 40:38; Lev. 9:24; 10:2; Num. 16:35; Ezekiel, chaps. 1 and 8. The latter, it would seem, was regarded as the light first created by God, while the former was the light of the heavenly bodies referred to in 1:14.

A moment's consideration will show that even the interpolation 1:16-19 is not a unit. 16*ba* is clearly a gloss; it anticipates unduly the thought sufficiently expressed in its proper place in 1:18*aa* and separates most awkwardly **וְאֵת הַכּוֹכָבִים** from its governing verb.

who introduced the Sabbath element into the story, with the consequent crowding of these two creative processes into one day. The original story must have recounted these two processes separately, with the blessing formula repeated in full in each case.

In 1:20 **נפש חיה** seems to be duplicative of **שרץ**. **שרץ** means only "creeping creatures." Therefore the combination **נפש חיה שרץ** is absolutely meaningless and impossible; **נפש חיה** must therefore be a gloss. Manifestly the author uses **שרץ** here in the same manner and for the same reason that he uses **עוף**, "winged creature," in preference to the more specific **דג** and **צפור**, as general, descriptive terms, in accordance with his customary procedure. This is implied also by the cognate verbs, **ישרצו** and **יעופו**, "let the waters creep with creeping things, and let winged creatures fly." But this implies that the original narrative probably told in customary manner of the giving of the specific names, **דג** and **צפור**.¹ Just how the original text read, in which the creation of fish and birds was probably recounted as two separate, independent creative processes, it is, of course, now impossible to determine with absolute certainty.²

Scholars have likewise concluded that the two creative processes on the sixth day, viz., of animals and man, were originally recounted separately.

The original, simple account of the creation of animals is not difficult to determine. Gen. 1:25 belongs to the "Sabbath" version, as we have already determined, and is, therefore, secondary.³ Moreover, in 1:24 the mention of the specific classes of animals, **בהמה ורמש והחית-ארץ**, is contrary to the regular procedure of

¹ For **צפור** as the specific name for birds, in contrast to **עוף**, cf. Deut. 14:11 ff.; but cf. Lev. 11:13 ff.

In all likelihood **על פני רקיע השמים** is a gloss explanatory of the seemingly rather vague **על הארץ**; this is indicated by the use of the compound **רקיע השמים** (cf. above, p. 185).

In 1:21 **את התנינים הגדלים** is obviously out of place. It is specific in its reference to a definite class of creatures, and logically should follow, and not precede, the more general and inclusive **נפש חיה הרמשת** and **עוף כנף**. It is probably a very late gloss inserted into the itself secondary verse, and was probably intended to account for the otherwise seemingly inexplicable existence of such creatures as the leviathan, the fish which swallowed Jonah, the fish of Tobit, and others.

² Cf. below, p. 204.

³ Cf. also the unexpected use of **הארמה** after **רמש**, instead of **הארץ**, otherwise constantly used in this chapter.

the original author, and is, moreover, duplicative of **נפש חיה**. In all likelihood, therefore, the original text read simply, **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וְיִהְיֶה כֵן**; the statement that God gave to each class of animals its specific name, **בְּהֵמָה**, **חַיִּיתוֹרֵאֶרֶץ**, and **רֶמֶשׂ**. This, in turn, was probably followed, just as in 1:22 and 28, by the statement that God blessed the animals, and thereby endowed them with the power of self-propagation, **וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת הָאָרֶץ**.

It is noteworthy that here, too, the animals are not just called into being out of a pre-existent state, but that the earth brings them forth, precisely as in 1:11 f. it brings forth the plants, and in 1:20 the waters bring forth, or swarm with, marine creatures. This was probably due, on the one hand, to the observation that the carcasses of animals decompose, and apparently become earthy matter again, just as, supposedly, they must have been at first, and, on the other hand, to the common, primitive conception of the earth as the great mother and source of all life, already referred to.

The account of the creation of man in 1:26-30, it is readily apparent, has been so completely recast by the "Sabbath" redactors, that it is no longer possible to determine with certainty what the original account may have been. The use of **נֶעֱשֶׂה** in 1:26, and also the use of the specific term **אָדָם**,¹ rather than some more general, descriptive term, betray a secondary hand. In all likelihood the original version told, just as in 1:11 and 24, and parallel to 1:20, that God commanded the earth to bring forth the creature, which later received the specific name, man.

Moreover, it is extremely doubtful whether the original "divine-fiat" version told that man was created in the image and likeness of God. For the conception of a deity so transcendental and spiritual as is implied in the thought that he creates merely through the utterance of his divine word, precludes the possibility of ascribing to him body or form,² and with this, of course, the thought that man was created in the form of a formless God.

Furthermore the accounts of the creation of plants and of the various kinds of animals imply, what is actually expressed in the

¹ Cf. below, pp. 189 f.

² The explanation of Holzinger and Ehrlich, that man's likeness to God is not physical, but consists only in dominion over the lower creatures, has been adequately refuted by Gunkel in his discussion of this passage.

blessing in 1:22, that they possess, or immediately after creation are endowed with, the power of self-propagation, without any essential change in their former nature and sex distinction being necessitated. In other words, sex distinction, it is implied, existed from the very beginning. Therefore, sex distinction in man from the very moment of creation on, is equally to be expected; and even had this not been explicitly stated in 1:27, which may perhaps be secondary, it would have to be inferred both from the general account of creation and from the specific injunction to multiply in the blessing in 1:28. But the implication that, like the other animals, man was created from the first in both male and female forms, accords but ill with the other implication that man was created in the image of the deity, certainly conceived by the early priestly writers as one, i.e., not two, one of each sex, and unanthropomorphic, i.e., not having any human, or even physical, form at all. From all this only one conclusion can be drawn, viz., that the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story could not have told that man was made in the image or likeness of God, and that this element must have come from the secondary "Sabbath" version of the story, as, in fact, the very language (1:26, נִעֲשֶׂה; 1:27, וַיִּבְרָא; cf. also 5:1, כִּי בִצְלֵם אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ, and 9:6 אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ) implies.

It is likewise to be noted that וַיִּדְּבֵר כֵּן at the end of 1:30 is clearly out of place. In its present position it seems to refer to the thought of 1:29 and 30 that God gives the vegetable world to man and the animals for food.¹ But in this connection it would be not only unnecessary, but also meaningless. Undoubtedly וַיִּדְּבֵר כֵּן here means exactly what it means in every other passage of the chapter, and implies, what we have already inferred, that the story in its original form told that man, precisely in the same manner as all other creatures, was called into existence by God's word alone. But in this case, just as in 1:20 and 22, we would expect וַיִּדְּבֵר כֵּן to have followed immediately after the statement, . . . וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, and to have preceded the blessing of 1:28a.

We would expect also that, just as in its account of the other creative processes, so here, too, the original "divine-fiat" version avoided at first the use of the specific term אָדָם, and used some

¹ So Ehrlich.

more general, descriptive term, and only after its **כִּן יִדְדִי** did it tell that God gave to this creature the generic name **אָדָם**. In the present version of the creation story this element is conspicuously absent. But in 5:2, a passage which is altogether reminiscent of the account of the creation of man in Genesis, chapter 1, and gives a brief synopsis thereof, we read, **וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמֵי אָדָם**. Manifestly this incident is out of place there.¹ In all likelihood it stood in the original "divine-fiat" version, probably in a somewhat fuller form,² and was transposed from there by the redactors. What general, descriptive term the original "divine-fiat" version may have employed to indicate this creature, before he received the specific name, it is, of course, impossible to determine.³

It is furthermore apparent that 1:28b repeats unnecessarily and even contradictorily the thought of 1:26b. For since 1:26b has already expressed the divine fiat that man is to have dominion over the lower creatures, this condition has thereby become an existent reality. Therefore, to express this thought again in 1:28b is superfluous and indicates not only that 1:28b is secondary, but also that its author did not fully comprehend the idea of the divine fiat. This is on a par with the fundamental thought and procedure of the "Sabbath" version, which finds it necessary to tell in each case, despite the divine fiat, that God made, etc.

Gen. 1:27 is obviously entirely secondary. One fact, however, is of particular interest. The seemingly inexplicable transition from the 3d singular **אָחָד** to the 3d plural **אָחָד** has been noticed by practically all commentators. Schwally changes **אָחָד** to **אֶחָד**, and chiefly on the basis of this hypothetical twofold use of **אָחָד** he bases his hypothesis that man was originally created bisexual, male and female in one. Gressmann⁴ proposes to change **אָחָד** to **אָחָד**, while

¹ It is self-evident that 5:2ab, containing the reference to the double sex of the first pair and to the blessing to be fruitful and multiply, is merely paving the way for the account of the birth of Seth and the subsequent generations. In this record **וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמֵי אָדָם בְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָה** clearly disturbs the logical continuity, and is therefore secondary in this passage. It was probably suggested by the motif of the following genealogical table of naming each successive child. Actually, however, a repetition of the blessing, . . . **פֶּרֶו וְרִבֵּו**, would have been a much more appropriate and logical continuation of the introduction to this table.

² Cf. Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

³ It could hardly have been **אִישׁ**, for this is almost, if not quite, as specific a term as **אָדָם**.

⁴ *ARW*, X (1907), 364, n. 2.

Gunkel holds to the present divergent readings, and regards 1:27 as a three-line fragment of an ancient creation poem.

It is to be noted that this same divergence between **אִתּוֹ** and **אִתָּם** exists in 5:1 and 2. It is significant that in only these two passages relating to the creation of man is the singular used. Elsewhere the plural alone is used; thus the verbs **וַיֵּרֶד** (26) and **פָּרָו**, **רָבוּ**, **מָלְאוּ**, **כִּבְשָׁה**, and **רָדוּ** (28), and the pronouns **אִתָּם** (28), **לָכֵם** (bis 29), **אִתָּם** (5:2), and the suffixes of **שָׁמַם** and **בְּהִרְאָם** (5:2). Furthermore it is to be noted that with reference to fish the plural is likewise used (22). Manifestly **אָדָם** was used in the original "divine-fiat"* version of the creation story as a generic term for man, referring to the species, just as does **דָּג**, **עוֹף** (or **צִפּוֹר**), **בְּהֵמָה**, etc., and in no wise referred to the first man alone, as Schwally maintains. On the other hand, the repetition of **אִתּוֹ** in 5:1, in exactly this same connection, and based clearly upon this passage, probably indicates that **אִתּוֹ** is original, and not the result of corruption of **אִתָּם**, as Gressmann thinks. This seeming difficulty can, however, be easily explained.

In addition to its use as a generic noun, denoting the species, mankind, **אָדָם** was also used as a proper noun, the actual name of the first man.¹ In all likelihood 1:27a β interpreted **אָדָם** or **הָאָדָם** in this sense, regardless of its use as a generic noun in 1:27aa and b. Gen. 1:27a β seemingly repeats in inverse form and altogether unnecessarily the thought of 1:27aa. Moreover, the use of **אֱלֹהִים** is rather awkward, in place of the noun with suffix. Obviously 1:27a β is not a part of the original form of the secondary verse 1:27.² This read simply and sufficiently, **וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם, בְּצַלְמוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם**.

In all likelihood **אֱלֹהִים** in 1:27a β is used, not in the sense of "deity," but in the late sense of "angels," as in Ps. 8:6. Gen. 1:27a β is therefore most probably a late, theological, marginal gloss, which eventually crept into the text, and which sought to obviate the objectionable anthropomorphism of the thought that man was created in the image of God himself, and also to interpret in a manner supposedly consonant with monotheistic doctrines, the

¹ Cf. 3:17 (unless we vocalize **וְלֹאָדָם**); 4:1 (**הָאָדָם**) and 25, and 5:3 ff.

² So also Ehrlich, *op. cit.*

plurals **נעשה** and **בצלמנו** in 1:26, by implying, what was actually held by later Judaism, that before creating man as the lord of the universe, God took counsel with his angels, just as in I Kings 22:19 ff., or Job 2:1 ff.¹

In all likelihood, also, **כדמותנו** in 1:26, clearly explanatory of or qualifying **בצלמנו**, is a gloss of similar nature and purpose. It, too, reduces somewhat the otherwise bald anthropomorphism of **בצלמנו**, by implying that man was created, not so much in the actual, literal, physical image of the deity, or even of the angels, but only in "something like" the image.²

In 1:28 the second **אלהים** is unmistakably a gloss.³

Gen. 1:29 and 30a likewise present many difficulties. In the first place it is to be noted that in the present Masoretic Text of 30 **אח-כל-י-ר-ק עשב** is absolutely without a governing word. The Septuagint seeks to help itself by inserting **ו** before **את**, but to no purpose. Most modern commentators have thought to solve the difficulty by inserting a second **נחתי** before **את**.⁴ Working, as they did, from the premise that the text of the creation story was practically a literary unit, and that any secondary matter was of small extent and little moment, some such procedure was necessary for them. But a moment's consideration must show that instead of removing the difficulty, the insertion of **נחתי** but heightens it, and even gives rise to serious contradictions.

Inserting **נחתי** before **אח-כל-י-ר-ק עשב**, Gunkel interprets the **ו** of **ולכל** at the beginning of 1:30 distributively. To man God gave all seed-bearing plants, i.e., grain, and all fruit trees, but to the animals God gave only the green herbs. In the first place it is questionable whether **עשב זרע זרע** means grain specifically, in contrast to **ירק עשב**, meaning specifically green herbs or vegetables. Certainly in 1:11 and 12 **עשב מזרע זרע** connotes all plant life, as contrasted with trees and their produce, and includes

¹ Cf. also Jubilees 2:2 and 18 f.

² Cf. the use of **כדמות**, Dan. 10:16, and its synonym, **כמראה**, Num. 9:15; Ezek. 1:26; Dan. 8:15, 10:18, and, in general, the use of **כ** in the vague sense of "something like," Ezek. 1:27, 10:1; Dan. 7:13.

³ So Gunkel.

⁴ So Dillmann, Holzinger, Gunkel, and Skinner.

grain and vegetables and all herbs.¹ In the second place, the ancients must have been perfectly aware that men ate not only grain but also vegetables and herbs, and that animals ate not only the latter but also grain and fruit. And while it is true that in the original mythological picture of the Golden Age, which, as Gunkel maintains, lies at the bottom of this passage and its corollary in 9:1-7, the idea obtained that at first, and again at the end, men and animals were to live in perfect peace and harmony, and not to prey upon and kill each other, even for food, there is not the slightest reason for surmising that the vegetable world was divided between them in the manner set forth by Gunkel in his interpretation of this passage. And, finally, this attempted solution of this difficulty is immediately disproved by 9:3, which states explicitly that ירק עשב had been previously given for food not only to animals but also to man. On this rock the entire second נחתי-hypothesis and Gunkel's interpretation shatter completely. The problem must be solved in a different way.

Understanding from 9:3 that ירק עשב was originally given as food by God to man as well as to animals, it is clear that 1:30a β seemingly repeats unnecessarily what has been already stated with considerable emphasis and verbiage in 1:29. ירק עשב here and in 9:3 is clearly an all-inclusive term, embracing not only all plants but also the fruit of trees. Inasmuch as we have already had reason to regard a considerable portion of the present text of the creation story as secondary, and to posit further that just such unnecessary repetitions, of which we have seen there are many, evidence the hand of the redactor, we may well draw the same conclusion here. And since 9:3 expressly mentions ירק עשב, with unmistakable reference to this passage, we may infer that ירק עשב is the original, and that, therefore, 1:29a β is secondary, an amplification made in the same pedantic, classifying spirit as the secondary portions of 1:11 and 12, and probably by the same hand.

¹ עֵץ (זרע) or עֵשֶׂב מִזֵּרִיעַ would correspond to the פֵּרִי הָאֲדָמָה and עֵץ to the פֵּרִי הָעֵץ of the ancient Jewish benediction. The only other additional classification of the vegetable world in the Jewish ritual is the פֵּרִי הַגֶּפֶן. But this by no means corresponds to the distinction which Gunkel would draw between עֵשֶׂב זֶרַע and יֵרֶק עֵשֶׂב.

Furthermore, **אשר בו נפש חיה** in 1:30, as it stands now, can refer only to **רומש**; if it were intended to refer to all the classes of animals mentioned here, we would expect the repetition of **לכל** before **אשר**. The words are, therefore, either a gloss, or, what seems on the whole more probable, are original, and all that precedes them in 1:30, with the exception of the first word, **ולכל**, is an amplificatory gloss of a classificatory nature, similar to 1:29a β b. The original text of 1:29–30a, accordingly, probably read simply, and much more effectively than the present clumsy and burdensome reading, **ויאמר אלהים הנה נתתי לכם ולכל-אשר-בו נפש חיה אחיכל-ירקני עשב לאכלה**.

But Kraetzschmar² has raised the very pertinent question, whether 1:29 and 30a, even in this primary, simple form, can have been a part of the original creation story. He maintains that the thought of these verses contradicts that of 1:26b. For dominion over the animal kingdom implies not only the use of domestic animals as aids in agricultural activity, but also the use of at least their milk products, if not their flesh, for food, and also of suitable wild animals, fish, and even creeping things.³ But this implication contradicts and excludes the thought of 1:29–30a. Unquestionably Kraetzschmar is correct, and 1:29–30a, even in its original, simple form, cannot have been a part of the original “divine-fiat” version of the creation story.⁴

¹ Not impossibly **ירק** is an insertion here, and the original read simply **אחיכל-עשב** as in 1:29; but cf. 9:3 (also a gloss; cf. below, p. 212).

² *Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament*, pp. 193 f.

³ Cf. Lev. 11:21 f.

⁴ This consideration is probably confirmed by the fact noted above, that **וירחי כן** in 1:30b is clearly out of place, and must have come originally after the account of the calling of man into existence by God's word, in the original of 1:26 and before the blessing in 1:28. Understanding that 1:29–30 are interpolations into the original text, the dislocation of **וירחי כן** from its original position is by no means so great and inexplicable as it seems at first glance.

Gunkel has admitted the incongruity of the thought of 1:29–30a with that of 1:26b. Nevertheless he maintains the literary unity of the present text, and accounts for the incongruity by the assumption that two originally independent and both very ancient myths, one dealing with creation and the other with the Golden Age, gradually fused, and this fused form became the basis for the present creation story. Were it not for the comparatively large mass of secondary material in the present text of the creation story, Gunkel's hypothesis might have been satisfactory. But as it is, it seems much more probable that 1:29–30a is not the result of an independent myth of the Golden Age fused with the creation story in its pre-literary form, but is rather an altogether secondary element in the literary form of the narrative.

It is also questionable to what extent the entire tradition of a primeval Golden Age is of ancient mythological origin, as Gunkel maintains. Certainly it does not go back to the desert, pastoral stage of Israel's cultural existence, for then it would have

There remains to be subjected to this detailed analysis only 1:1, 2 and 2:4. In the light of the presence of a considerable mass of secondary material in the creation story, which we have established, we need not hesitate for one moment to regard 1:2 in its entirety as secondary. Not only does it disturb the continuity of the narrative but, as has been most clearly pointed out by Gunkel, it contains material from three different and altogether independent, and probably mythological, sources. In 1:2^{aa} the reference to *תהו ובהו* is so vague, and the antecedents of this strange expression are so completely unknown, or at least insecure, that nothing can be affirmed of it with certainty. It can hardly have been a part of the original creation story. Possibly some mythological concept, perhaps Phoenician in origin, lies at the bottom of the expression.

spoken of milk products and the flesh of wild animals as food, rather than of vegetable products. The tradition clearly sprang up in an agricultural environment. But all the biblical references to this supposedly primeval Golden Age, cited by Gunkel, are speculative and theological in character, rather than mythological, and are all, moreover, the literary products of the post-exilic period (despite Gunkel's earnest attempt to assert pre-exilic dates for some of these biblical passages, pp. 122 ff.). They all proceed from the premise that bloodshed in the abstract is a great, probably the supreme, sin, and the cause of all the misery, calamity, and divine punishment upon earth; and this means the slaying not only of man by man but also of man by animals, and even of animals by other animals for food alone. Certainly this is a concept altogether foreign to the life and habit of thought of early man, even in an agricultural environment. It is much rather the product of speculative reasoning carried to the utmost logical extreme, such as is characteristic of the most rigid, ascetic, and mystic theologians. Moreover, in all the biblical references to the Golden Age we find no indications at all of mythological personages or heroic deeds; and without these there is no mythology. For these reasons we are compelled to reject Gunkel's entire hypothesis of an ancient myth of a primeval Golden Age current in Israel, and to regard the tradition thereof as entirely the product of late, post-exilic theological speculation.

All this carries with it the further implication that 9:1-7 is likewise a secondary passage in the Priestly Code. Here, too, we have an unmistakable reference to the Golden Age tradition. Moreover, it is unnecessarily and suspiciously duplicative of the creation story. Thus 1:28 told that the power of self-propagation had been conferred upon man; but 9:1 repeats this, not as a mere renewal of the blessing of 1:28, which would have been quite unnecessary, but as something entirely new. Furthermore, 9:2 seems to misinterpret, or at least reinterpret, the thought of 1:26b, that man is to have dominion over the animals, as meaning only that the animals shall fear man. Furthermore, as has been already noted, 9:6b refers to the secondary tradition of man's being created in the image of God, in language that points unmistakably to the secondary "Sabbath" version. Finally, the blessing here alongside of the account of the covenant in 9:8-17, likewise from the Priestly Code, seems tautological and superfluous. Inasmuch as the covenant motif in 9:8-17 is the indispensable conclusion of 6:18, these verses must be an integral part of the original priestly version of the flood story. Accordingly it is to be inferred from this also that 9:1-7 are secondary in the Priestly Code.

Manifestly they were introduced to establish a supposedly authoritative basis for the important ritual institution of the prohibition of eating the blood, as well as for the ethical prohibition of human bloodshed. And just as the entire ritualistic Sabbath motif in the creation story is secondary, so here the ritualistic prohibition of bloodshedding and blood-eating is likewise secondary.

Certainly the Phoenician cosmogonic myth of the origin of the world from a great egg lies at the bottom of 1:2b. The *רוח אלדמים* is here conceived as a gigantic female bird, which hovers or broods upon the surface of the waters, and from which the universe egg is ultimately hatched.¹ With this conception of the divine spirit in the form of a bird may be compared the undoubtedly related picture of the divine spirit descending upon Jesus in the form of a dove.² Obviously these two vague, and presumably mythological, references bear absolutely no relation to the main creation narrative, either in the original "divine-flat" version or in its present expanded form.

¹ Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*³, p. 125; Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 48 ff.

² Matt. 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22. Parallel, and undoubtedly dependent upon this, is the tradition recorded by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 29, transl. Boyle, p. 249), that at the ordination of Fabianus as bishop of Rome, "a dove, suddenly flying down from on high, sat upon his head, exhibiting a scene like that of the Holy Spirit once descending upon our Saviour in the form of a dove. Upon this the whole body exclaimed with all eagerness and with one voice, as if moved by the one spirit of God, that he was worthy; and without delay they took him and placed him upon the episcopal throne." With this may be compared the tradition which obtained in Jerusalem as late as the end of the seventeenth century, that at the ceremony of the descent of the holy fire in the Church of the Sepulchre on the afternoon preceding Easter Sunday, the Holy Spirit in the form of a pigeon was actually thought to come down from heaven to a place in the church just above the holy sepulchre, and immediately thereafter the holy fire would appear from out the sepulchre. (Maunderell, "A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter, 1697," ed. Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 463.)

According to Talmudic tradition, which may, perhaps, have a slight basis of historic truth, the Samaritans had an image resembling a cock-pigeon, which they worshiped (*Hullin* 6a; *Jer.* 'Aboda Zara V, 44d, bottom). Among the Syrians and other ancient Semites the dove was considered sacred, and was, therefore, as a rule, not eaten, (cf. the numerous references to classical literature in Chwolson, *Die Saabier und der Saabismus*, II, 107 f., n. 74), and at Hierapolis was not even touched for fear of sacred pollution. (Lucian *De Dea Syria* 54.) Moreover, according to the common Syrian tradition, Semiramis had been transformed into a dove; and at Hierapolis there stood a peculiar golden image with a dove upon its head, which some therefore identified with Semiramis. (Lucian, *op. cit.*, 33.) And in Mecca still today the dove or pigeon is regarded as sacred, and therefore not to be killed or eaten. Of the doves of Mecca di Varthema says (*Travels of Ludovico di Varthema 1503-1508*, pub. by Hakluyt Society, ed. Badger, 45 f.): "We found in the street of the said city fifteen thousand or twenty thousand doves, which, they say, are of the stock of that dove which spoke to Mahomet in the form of the Holy Spirit, which doves fly about in the whole district at their pleasure. . . . They are not at liberty to kill them or catch them." And a modern traveler (Wm. Ellery Curtis, *Today in Syria and Palestine*, p. 148) tells us: "Pigeons are almost as numerous (as sparrows), but are never killed. They are sacred in all Mohammedan countries. Some people say that the Mohammedans are afraid of exterminating the Holy Spirit, which inhabits the dove; others, that they remember the dove which brought the olive branch back to the ark." This evidence shows the important rôle which the dove has played in the mythology of at least the western Semites from the earliest times to the present day, and particularly the frequency with which the Holy Spirit has been thought to manifest itself in the form of a dove. Undoubtedly a mythological concept, closely related to this, lies at the bottom of Gen. 1:2b.

Gen. 1:2a β with its reference to תהום probably shows a closer relationship to the presumably mythological original of the creation story. But it is significant that, with the exception of this one passage, the biblical creation story avoids the term תהום, whereas in 1:6, and again in the secondary 1:7, it might have used this term very conveniently and appositely, had it so wished. The avoidance of the term was probably intentional, the result of the characteristic desire of the priestly authors and redactors to reduce the mythological elements in their narrative to a minimum. That the term תהום was current in Israel from a much earlier date is apparent from such early passages as Gen. 49:25, Deut. 33:13, and Amos 7:4. Unquestionably, too, the word is derived from the Babylonian *Tiāmat*. And its early use in Hebrew attests early Israelite acquaintance with the Babylonian *Enuma Eliš* epic, or at least with the Babylonian creation myth in some form or other. Undoubtedly, therefore, the priestly authors of the creation story purposely avoided the use of the word תהום in their narrative, just as they avoided any explicit reference to the combat of the deity with and triumph over *Tiāmat*-תהום, to which references abound in other less anti-mythological portions of the Bible.¹ Manifestly, therefore, 1:2a β , although mythologically related to the main narrative, is, from the standpoint of literary composition, not a part of the original version. Accordingly the whole of 1:2 must be an interpolation, probably inserted by some writer or writers who felt that the original authors had missed something that seemed essential, viz., a descriptive allusion to the condition of chaos that preceded creation. Whether 1:2aa, 2a β , and 2b, originally unrelated so far as mythological origin and content are concerned, were interpolated by one or more hands, cannot, of course, be determined.

Gen. 2:4 has been frequently discussed by biblical scholars, and various solutions of the problems it presents have been suggested. All the biblical material intervening between 2:4 and 5:1 belongs to the J document. Assuming that 2:4, or at least 2:4a, was an integral part of the Priestly Code, it would seem to have stood originally next to 5:1, with which it must have collided. It is difficult to think that these two verses could have ever been in such

¹ Cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, pp. 29–114, and *Genesis*², p. 127.

immediate juxtaposition. Partly for this reason, and partly because he observed that with this one seeming exception all the *תולדת* passages in P introduce a genealogical table, instead of concluding it, and partly also because it is self-apparent that 1:1 opens rather abruptly, Ilgen proposed to transpose 2:4a to precede 1:1, and to regard it as the original introduction to the creation story, which, for some reason or other, had been removed from its original position to its present place at the close, probably as a kind of summary of the creation story. In this Ilgen has been followed, rather hesitatingly, however, by a number of later scholars.

Ilgen's premises are unquestionably correct; but it does not follow that his solution must be equally correct, or is the only possible solution to be offered. Actually this solution shatters on two great obstacles, as Holzinger and, after him, more fully and convincingly, Skinner have shown. In the first place it is significant that in 2:4a *תולדות* is used in a sense altogether different from its meaning in every other passage of the Bible. Everywhere else *תולדת* means "genealogy" or "genealogical table." Here it can have this meaning only in the very remotest degree. Moreover, in absolutely every other case *תולדת* is in the construct state with a proper noun, designating the first progenitor of the human family referred to; thus in 5:1 the *תולדת אדם* are the descendants begotten in direct line from Adam. But in 2:4a *תולדות השמים והארץ* cannot mean "descendants of heaven and earth," nor even "the genealogical table of heaven and earth." In fact it is almost impossible to tell just what it does mean literally and exactly. Judging from the context it would seem to mean "the stages of being born or created," and this seems to be the implication of the peculiar *בהפראם*. But this is, it must be admitted, a strange, unattested, and improbable meaning for *תולדת*.

Moreover, it is difficult to imagine any sufficient reason for the transposition of the verse from its supposedly original position before 1:1 to its present awkward position, as Ilgen postulates. Such procedure would be absolutely inexplicable.

For these reasons Holzinger and Skinner have rejected Ilgen's hypothesis, and have suggested instead that 2:4a may be the work

¹ With three very doubtful exceptions, Gen. 6:9; 25:19; 37:2; cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 39 f.

of a redactor, who noticed that the Priestly Document was seemingly divided into certain logical sections by the oft-repeated formula, **אלה חולדת**, and, believing that creation itself marked a distinct epoch in the history of the universe, felt the need of some corresponding **אלה חולדת** colophon or summary here also. Probably he hesitated to place this at the very beginning, not only of the story, but also of the entire Priestly Code, and even of the entire Torah, and so he inserted it, very inaptly, at the end of the story. Such is the theory of Holzinger and Skinner, elaborated slightly. This hypothesis of the secondary character of 2:4a is rendered more probable by the fact of the presence of a considerable mass of secondary material in the creation story, as we have established, and also by the use of the word **ברא**.¹

But it is possible, and even imperative, to carry the hypothesis farther. Almost from the beginning of modern biblical science 2:4a and 2:4b have been separated, and the former has been assigned to what we now call the Priestly Code, and considered as the conclusion of the priestly account of creation in 1:1—2:3, while the latter has been assigned to what we now call the Yahwist Code, and regarded as the beginning of the J story of creation in the remainder of chapter 2. The grounds for this differentiation between 2:4a and 2:4b have been simple and seemingly convincing. The presence of the two words **חולדת** and **בהבראם**, both characteristic of P, and the apparent connection of this half-verse with the priestly account of creation in 1:1—2:3, have indicated its priestly authorship beyond all possibility of doubt. On the other hand the presence of the strange combination **יהוה אלהים** in 2:4b and throughout the J narrative in 2:5—3:24 was thought to indicate sufficiently the immediate connection of 2:4b with the following J account of creation, and its consequent J authorship.

But with the exception of this **יהוה אלהים**, everything in 2:4b points rather to priestly than to Yahwistic authorship. It mentions the making of heaven and earth, just as is told in the priestly story. But, contrary to this, the Yahwist story not only makes no mention at all of the creation of heaven and earth, but takes the eternal existence of these for granted; or, rather, it does not conceive

¹ Cf. below, pp. 201 f.

that heaven and earth did not at one time exist, and that, in consequence, it had to tell of their being created.¹

Moreover, we have seen that the term עשה is used constantly and characteristically in the secondary portions of the priestly creation story, just as it is used here. On the other hand, the Yahwist narrative designates the actual, fundamental, life-giving activities of the deity graphically by the word יצר (2:7, 8, 19), and uses עשה only once, in 3:21, to designate the altogether secondary act of God's, not creating, but rather inventing or putting together the first garments for the man and woman out of the skins of animals.² Furthermore, in 2:22, where it might well have used עשה, it uses instead בנה to designate the making over of the man's rib into the woman. Manifestly עשה is not a term characteristic of the authors of the Yahwist creation story.³

Moreover, Skinner has called attention to the fact that in Gen. 5:1 and Num. 3:1 . . . אלה חולדת is followed by ביום, just as here. Here and in 5:1 יום is in the construct state with an infinitive, while in Num. 3:1 we have the perfect, דבר, instead of the expected infinitive, דבר, as is so frequently the case with this particular verb.⁴ In other words, the expression (infinitive or clause) ביום . . . אלה חולדת is found three times in the Pentateuch, twice in passages which belong unmistakably to P, and once, here in Gen. 2:4, in a passage, the first half of which certainly

¹ Cf. my article, "The Sources of the Paradise Story," *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, I (1918), 105-23 and 225-40.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 226 f., n. 19. Gen. 3:21 may itself be a secondary element in the paradise narrative. In such case, in view of its marked relationship to the Phoenician tradition that the first garments were made by Usoos out of the skins of animals (Sanchuniathon, in Eusebius *Praepar. Evangel.* i. 10), we might infer that 3:21 is the work of the same glossator who inserted 1:2b, likewise based upon a Phoenician tradition, as we have seen.

³ It is certain that אשר עשה יהוה אלהים in 3:1 is a gloss (cf. "The Sources of the Paradise Story," *op. cit.*, p. 112, n. 8), probably by the same priestly redactor as 2:4. It is altogether unnecessary, and even disturbs the smooth continuity of the narrative slightly.

It may likewise be remarked in passing that the awkward נפש חיה in 2:19 is a meaningless gloss, probably by the same redactor. Possibly, too, ואת כל עוף השמים in 2:19 is a similar gloss; for the birds of heaven could hardly have been conceived of as potential helpmates for man, as were the domestic animals (*op. cit.*, pp. 110 f.). At the most only the domesticated fowl could be considered in this light, and, on the one hand, these were so few at that time that they were practically negligible for consideration in this light, and, on the other hand, would hardly be designated by the term עוף השמים.

⁴ Cf. Exod. 6:28; Deut. 4:15; Hos. 1:2; also Jer. 5:13; assuming, of course, that the correction to דבר is unnecessary.

belongs to P and the second half of which bears in content and direct relationship to the preceding priestly narrative, and in form shows, with one single and easily accounted for exception, viz., the use of **יהוה אלהים**, all the earmarks of priestly authorship.

Accordingly, instead of regarding 2:4b as Yahwistic, as in the past, the entire verse must be regarded as priestly, the work of a redactor, in all likelihood RJEDP. In order to strengthen the appearance of unity between the priestly and Yahwist narratives, to establish which this verse was inserted, he used the compound name, **יהוה אלהים**, for the deity, just as in the J narrative, in place of the simple **אלהים**, as in the priestly narrative. The effectiveness of this procedure is best evidenced by the perfect unanimity with which scholars have, until the present, mistakenly assigned 2:4b to J.

Only 1:1 remains to be considered. The discussion of this verse hinges upon the word **ברא**. Attention has frequently been called to two marked peculiarities of this word. In the Bible it is used to designate the creative activities of the deity alone, and is never used of human activity, and it never takes the accusative of the material from which a thing is made, as do other verbs of making, but uses the accusative to designate only the thing made. From this many scholars have concluded that the word has a peculiar theological connotation, designating the unanthropomorphic, effortless creative activity of the deity through the exercise of his will alone,¹ that is particularly appropriate to the story of creation by God's fiat alone.

But it is significant that **ברא** is used constantly elsewhere in the Bible as a synonym of other verbs of making or creating, with apparently little or no distinction in meaning. Thus it is used as a synonym of **עשה** in Isa. 41:20; 43:7; 45:7, 18; of **יצר** in Isa. 43:1, 7; 45:7, 18; Amos 4:13; of **בנן**, Isa. 45:18, and of **יסד**, Ps. 89:12 f., while in Genesis, chapter 1, it is, as we have seen, likewise used as a synonym of **עשה**² without the slightest shade of difference in meaning being apparent. And, as we have seen, **עשה**, as used in Gen. 1—2:4, implies physical activity on the part of the deity, and not the purely unanthropomorphic, mandatory creative power as set

¹ So Ibn Ezra on Gen. 1:1; Dillmann, *Genesis*⁴, p. 17; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*⁵, pp. 304 and 387; Gunkel, *Genesis*³, p. 102; Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 14 f.

² Cf. 1:21 and 27 with 25.

forth in the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story. We have seen that all the עשה passages in 1:1—2:4 are secondary, and that the same is true of every ברא passage thus far considered. Moreover, in 1:21 and 27, ברא is used, as has been said, as an exact synonym of עשה, as in 25.¹ It is clear, therefore, that the meaning of supernatural, creative activity through the exercise of the divine will alone, read into ברא by the above-mentioned scholars, has not the slightest foundation, and that, accordingly, ברא has no connection at all with the fundamental principle of the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story, viz., creation by God's word alone. In other words, ברא in 1:1, just as in every other passage in which it occurs, has no relation with the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story, but as a synonym of עשה, as used elsewhere in secondary passages in the present text, connotes an idea altogether at variance with the original version. This stamps 1:1 also as secondary, the work of a redactor, probably again RJEDP.²

But this makes one thing clear: 1:3 cannot have been the actual beginning of the original "divine-fiat" version of the creation story. It is too abrupt for a proper beginning, and it presumes the presence of certain conditions which must have been described in the original version, and the narrative of which must have, for reasons which can only be surmised, been suppressed by the redactor.

This completes our analysis of the present text of the creation story. We have found that it consisted of an original simple account of the creation of the universe by means of divine mandates uttered by a deity, conceived of as too transcendental and spiritual to be

¹ LXX renders ברא and עשה in all three cases indiscriminately ἐποίησεν, as also here in 1:1. In fact only in 2:3 and 4 does LXX render ברא by any verb other than ποιέω. In 2:3 it renders ברא by ἤγαγεν, and in 2:4 בהבאם, ὅτε ἐγένετο. Elsewhere, too, LXX makes no distinction between ברא and its various synonyms. In fourteen passages outside of the creation story it renders ברא by some form of κτίζω, in twelve passages by some form of ποιέω, in two passages by a form of καταδείκνυμι, and in two passages by a form of κατασκευάζω. Obviously LXX attached no particular connotation to ברא, theological or otherwise, different from that held by other verbs of making or creating.

² In view of the secondary character of 1:1, and also of 1:2, the problem of whether בראשית is in the absolute or construct state loses its theological import entirely, and likewise much of its grammatical significance. Probably in view of the ביום ברא of 5:1 and the ביום עשות יהוה אלהים of 2:4, both verses in all likelihood the work of the same redactor as 1:1, we should read, בראשית ברא, as was proposed already by Rashi. With this reading the redactorial character of 1:1 is all the more apparent.

invested with human attributes, or to create in perfectly human manner by the work of his hands. This original narrative was greatly, almost completely, recast by later writers or editors, who operated chiefly from theological motives. Their primary purpose was to introduce the idea of the Sabbath as a day of rest divinely instituted for all mankind already at creation. To carry out their purpose they were compelled to sacrifice something of the transcendentalism and unanthropomorphism of the original, and reintroduce the old idea, most clearly expressed in the Yahwist account of creation, of God making things, impliedly, though purposely not expressed, with his hands, and wearying himself through his exertions, and therefore resting on the seventh day. Incidentally they of necessity recast the details of the story, and crowded the various processes of creation into six days, in order to pave the way for the Sabbath upon the seventh day. They also introduced the motif of God reviewing the result of each creative act and pronouncing it good. They also incorporated the motifs of man being created in the image of the deity, and of the primeval Golden Age, when there was as yet no shedding of blood and eating of flesh. Moreover, they took considerable liberties with the text, particularly with the introduction, which they seem to have suppressed completely, and with the account of the creation of man, which they recast so thoroughly that of the original hardly more remains now than the, in its present context, almost meaningless **וַיְהִי כֵן** of 1:30, and the blessing in 1:28a.

As nearly as we can reconstruct it, the original text of the creation story must have been as follows:¹

(An introductory statement, probably brief, and describing the condition of chaos which was at first.)²

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי אוֹר וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים בֵּין הָאֹר וּבֵין
 הַחֹשֶׁךְ וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לָאוֹר יוֹם וּלְחֹשֶׁךְ קִרָּא לַיְלָה:
 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי רִקִּיעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַמַּיִם וַיְהִי מִבְדִּיל בֵּין מַיִם לַמַּיִם
 וַיְהִי כֵן: וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לָרִקִּיעַ שָׁמַיִם:

¹ () indicate that a portion of the original text has been suppressed.

² Not impossibly **וַיְהִי עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם** of 1:2a² is a reminiscence of this original introduction. Certainly the references thereto in 1:3 and 4 indicate that the suppressed introduction must have made some mention of the **חֹשֶׁךְ**.

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִקְוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל מְקוֹה אֶחָד וְתִרְאֶה
הִיבֶשֶׁה וַיְהִי כֵן: וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לִיבֶשֶׁה אֶרֶץ וּלְמְקוֹה הַמַּיִם קְרָא
יָמִים:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ דָּשָׁא וַיְהִי כֵן: (וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְדָשָׁא
ה עֵץ וּלְדָשָׁא ה קְרָא עֵשֶׂב:)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי מֵאֲרֶת בַּשָּׁמַיִם וַיֵּאֱדָרְוּ עַל הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי כֵן:
(וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְמֵאֲדָרְוּ הַגְּדֹל שֶׁמֶשׁ וּלְמֵאֲדָרְוּ הַקָּטָן קְרָא יָרֵחַ:)
וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרְצוּ הַמַּיִם שְׂרָץ וַיְהִי כֵן: (וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְשְׂרָץ
הַמַּיִם דֵּג(?):) וַיְבָרֶךְ אוֹתָם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת
הַמַּיִם בַּיָּמִים: (וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יַעֲוֹפֶף עוֹף עַל הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי כֵן:
וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְעוֹף צִפּוֹר(?):) וַיְבָרֶךְ אוֹתָם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ
וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת הָ—:)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וַיְהִי כֵן: (וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים
לְנֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר הוֹצִיָּאתָ הָאָרֶץ בַּחֲמָה וּרְמֵשׁ וְחִיתוֹ אֶרֶץ: וַיְבָרֶךְ
אוֹתָם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת הָאָרֶץ:)
וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים (תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ

וַיְהִי כֵן: וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְ— אָדָם: וַיְבָרֶךְ אוֹתָם אֱלֹהִים
לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת הָאָרֶץ וּכְבִּשְׁתֶּה:
וַיִּכְלּוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל צַבָּאָם:

There cannot be the slightest doubt that this original version of the creation story is entirely the work of priestly writers. The consistent use of the term אֱלֹהִים to designate the deity, and also the use of such characteristic terms as שְׂרָץ, פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ, צַבָּא, as well as the pedantic, formulistic style, would be in themselves sufficient indications of priestly authorship.

But even more significant is the conception of the deity. The central theme of the narrative is not so much the creation of the universe as the creation of the universe through the mere word of God alone, and entirely without human-like, physical activity. This conception of an altogether transcendental, unanthropomorphic deity, motionless and timeless as it were, free from all the restraints that limit human activity and power, with no lowly, human attributes, so the story implies, other than the power of

speech and command, and with this command, unlike that of humans, irresistible in power and infallible and perfect in execution, such a conception of deity is far beyond anything conceived of in the J document, particularly in connection with the Yahwist creation story in Gen. 2. On the other hand, it accords fully with the priestly conception of the deity in the form of the *k^{eb}hod Yahwe*, a fiery apparition enveloped in the cloud, ordinarily invisible to mortal eye, infallible in judgment and decision, and prompt and irresistible in action.¹

Moreover, the conception of the word of God as the creative force is manifestly related to the theological concepts of Wisdom as the companion and agent of the deity in the wisdom literature,² of the *amātu*, the divine word, in Babylonian religious literature of the Seleucid period,³ of the *memrâ* in Targumic literature,⁴ and of the *Logos* in Gnostic writings.⁵ However, inasmuch as the divine word in Gen. 1 is not yet a personified being, apart from and independent of the deity, his agent and associate, as are Wisdom, the *amātu*, the *memrâ*, and the *Logos*, it is clear that Gen. 1 presents an early stage of the evolution of this peculiar theological concept, an early stage such as would be expected in a priestly writing of the close of the sixth or of the beginning of the fifth century B.C.

This likewise tends to confirm the already sufficient refutation by Gunkel of Budde's hypothesis that the priestly account of creation must have been based upon an older literary version, the work of J2 writers. There is absolutely nothing in the original priestly literary version, as we have reconstructed it, to indicate an earlier, Yahwist form of the narrative, or to require the assumption thereof. In form and in thought this original narrative not only bears all the earmarks of priestly composition, but also differs too greatly from fundamental Yahwist concepts to permit of any such assumption.

On the other hand, Gunkel's argument that this creation tradition must have been current in Israel from very ancient times,

¹ Cf. my article, "Biblical Theophanies," *ZA*, XXV (1912), 141-53.

² Cf. Proverbs 8:22-31.

³ Cf. Reissner, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen nach Tontafeln griechischer Zeit*, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, and 13, and Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, XVIII f.

⁴ Cf. Kohler, in *JE*, VIII, 464 f.

⁵ Cf. my article, "Biblical Theophanies," *op. cit.*, XXVII (1914), 52 f.

because of the presence in it of terms of presumably ancient, mythological character and origin, such as תהו ובהו, תהום, and ברא, is likewise refuted. In the first place, Gunkel makes the assumption that these terms are all ancient and of mythological origin entirely without positive evidence therefor. תהום is undoubtedly a term, mythological in origin, and, it may be inferred from Gen. 49:25; Deut. 33:13, and Amos 7:4, of early usage in Israel.¹ But the other two terms do not appear in biblical literature before the Deuteronomic period, and probably were not used earlier.² And, in the second place, in the original text, as we have reconstructed it, not one of these terms was used.³ The words occur only in the late, secondary passages, ברא as a pure synonym of עשה, and תהו ובהו, just as used elsewhere, in the absolutely unmythological, colorless meaning of waste and empty. This disposes of Gunkel's hypothesis of the necessarily very ancient existence of this creation tradition in Israel in a preliterate form.

It is noteworthy that the original text, as we have reconstructed it, is, in the ordinary sense, singularly free from all mythological elements. This was to be expected. For mythology, by its very nature, presupposes the concept of gods and heroes in purely human form, and endowed with human attributes and human virtues and failings. But here the absolutely monotheistic, transcendental conception of the deity could not tolerate anything in the slightest degree mythological in character. This, too, is characteristic of the primary portions of the Priestly Code.

However, it is clear that just in this original creation story, and not at all in the secondary interpolations, do we have contact with the well-known Babylonian creation epic. Of the secondary motifs of the biblical creation story, viz., the Sabbath, with the six-day creation period, the Golden Age at the beginning of existence, and man created in the divine image, only the last bears even the slightest relationship to the Babylonian epic. On the other hand, the original biblical creation story told, like the Babylonian epic, of the separation by the deity of the primeval watery chaos, presumably called

¹ Cf. above, p. 197.

² Cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*⁶, p. 387.

³ Unless, as has been suggested above, תהום in 1:2a⁸ be a reminiscence of the original introduction, suppressed by the redactor.

תהום, into two bodies of water, one above and one below, of the fixing of the bounds of the lower ocean and of the bringing forth of the earth in its midst, of the creation of the heavenly bodies, and, finally, of man. Not unlikely, the still missing portions of the Babylonian epic may have told of the creation by Marduk of plant and animal life on earth in a manner similar to the account in Genesis, chapter 1. And, finally, the word of Marduk in the Babylonian epic is all-powerful and irresistible,¹ just as, although with far different and less spiritual application than, the word of Yahwe. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the original priestly creation story is related to the earlier Babylonian myth.

But, as Gunkel has pointed out conclusively, this relationship is indirect, rather than direct. The differences between the Babylonian myth and the biblical story in its original form are quite as far-reaching and significant as are the points of contact. Actually, as Gunkel has clearly shown,² various references scattered throughout the Bible, but found almost entirely in post-exilic writings, evidence the existence in Israel, at least in the post-exilic period, of a tradition of Yahwe's victorious combat with a terrible monster, assisted by helpers of a like character, and of the subsequent creation of the universe, which resembled the Babylonian myth in character and details much more closely than did the original priestly creation story. We must, therefore, conclude with Gunkel, that the original priestly creation story was related only indirectly to the Babylonian myth, and that it was directly based upon an Israelitish version of this myth, which had in some way become current in Israel, and from which the priestly authors, in characteristic manner, stripped all mythological elements in their literary version.

Just when this tradition in its preliterate form became current in Israel, it is difficult to determine. Probably the only correct procedure would be to consider this question in connection with the larger question of the time when other traditions of an unmistakably Babylonian origin, such as the flood story, became current in Israel. It can be easily demonstrated that the J version of the flood story in its literary form is the product of the very latest period of Yahwist

¹ Cf. Tablet IV, 22-26. However, since this word of Marduk plays no rôle at all in the remaining portions of the Babylonian epic, this may be a secondary element therein.

² *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 29-114, and *Genesis*³, pp. 127 f.

literary activity, probably about the middle of the seventh century B.C. But it is not impossible that here, too, a preliterate tradition of the flood may have been long current in Israel.

The use of תְּהוֹם in Gen. 49:25; Deut. 33:13, and Amos 7:4, even assuming that all three passages are genuine, is not altogether indicative; for, granting that תְּהוֹם is a Hebraization of the Babylonian *Tiāmat*, the word תְּהוֹם may have become current by itself in Western Asia at an early date, in the purely colorless meaning, the ocean, without immediate dependence upon the Babylonian myth; in other words, Israel may have adopted the word תְּהוֹם into its language without necessarily being at all acquainted with the Babylonian myth. Nor is there any assurance that the serpent at the bottom of the sea in Amos 9:3 is Tiamat, or is based upon a reminiscence of Tiamat. Sea-serpent traditions and myths were, we know, current among the maritime Phoenicians, and, in all likelihood, passed directly from them to Israel through the natural channels of commerce. Such a conception of a living, monstrous sea serpent, lying at the bottom of the ocean in wait for his prey, would be a much more natural basis for Amos 9:3 than the myth of Tiamat, identical with the sea itself, slain by Marduk, and with her body cut in twain. All in all, therefore, we must regard the question of the antiquity of the Babylonian myth in Israel as by no means settled, despite Gunkel's positive assertions of a very ancient date,¹ and leave the solution of this highly important problem for further investigation.

III

In the secondary interpolations into the creation story, the primary element is the introduction of the Sabbath as a day of rest, with its corollary, the six days of work for the deity, and impliedly also for man. As we have seen, the introduction of the Sabbath motif into the creation story probably went hand in hand with the revision of the religious calendar, with its change in the system of counting the days, and with the ultimate shifting of the dates of the festivals, the introduction of Yom Kippur on the 10th day of the 7th month, the transfer of Rosh Hashona from the 10th to the 1st day of the 7th month, and of Succoth from the 3d through

¹ Cf. his detailed argument in *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 114-70.

the 10th day of the 7th month to the 15th through the 21st, and ultimately through the 22d.¹ Inasmuch as Yom Kippur was still unknown to Ezra, and also inasmuch as it can be easily shown that even Pg knew only the old calendar system, with Rosh Hashona on the 10th day of the 7th month, and the culminating climax of the Succoth–New Year’s festival, it follows that these secondary passages in the creation story must be the product of the period after Ezra. The revision of the creation story for the evident purpose of representing the Sabbath as the first, and, therefore, presumably as the fundamental institution of religion, undoubtedly goes hand in hand with the Sabbath reforms of Nehemiah (9:14; 10:32; 13:15–22), with the emphasis laid upon strict Sabbath observance by Trito-Isaiah (56:2–6; 58:13 f.; 66:23), and with the Sabbath legislation in other, likewise secondary, portions of the Priestly Code (Exod. 16:22–27; 35:2 f.; Lev. 23:3; Num. 28:9 f.). Accordingly, this first redaction of the original creation story may be confidently set at some time after Nehemiah, presumably in the fourth century B.C.

One matter is of primary interest and significance. This revision of the creation story recast it completely and made it accessible to and significant for an entirely different and far larger group than the priestly authors of the original “divine-fiat” version could have possibly had in mind. For the conception of a motionless, unanthropomorphic, transcendental deity, such as was depicted in the original priestly creation story, was purely speculative, philosophic and theological in character, and could have had little meaning and message for the people at large. It was clearly the product of the thinking of priestly theologians, and in its original form could have been generally current only in esoteric, priestly circles.

The revision of the creation story altered this completely. It gave a practical application to the story, and brought the conception of the deity, set forth therein, down to the level of the folk-mind and folk-intelligence. The deity, previously transcendental, unanthropomorphic, and abstract, once more became, as in the earlier and more primitive Yahwistic folk-traditions, immanent and active,

¹ Cf. my article, “Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* (New Series), VIII (1917), 31–55.

conceived with purely human attributes, working with his hands, wearying himself, even as men weary themselves, and therefore needing rest and refreshment on every seventh day. Man is like him in this and many other respects; hence the idea that man was made in the image of God. This represents, in a way, a harking back to old traditions and conceptions of the deity, such as are recorded in the Yahwist creation story in Gen. 2, and elsewhere in that book of folk-traditions, and likewise in the prophets.¹ The prophets were not philosophers or theologians; at least in their messages to the people they did not consciously philosophize or theologize beyond the comprehension of the masses. They spoke to the people in their own language of a God close and living, whom the people could visualize, comprehend, and revere.

Just this this first revision of the creation story does. It takes the original, abstract, theological creation story, relegates the speculative, theological element to a secondary position, and gives the story a practical application and a human touch by introducing the Sabbath motif, with its corollary of six days of work, and with its thought that man was made in the image of God, and is therefore not far from and infinitely beneath him, as the "divine-fiat" motif implies, but is close to him and beloved by him,² and the cognate thought that all this universe which God has made, he has made good, i.e., good judged by human standards, in other words, good for man. This thought of the goodness of the universe found concrete expression in the tradition of the Golden Age at the beginning of existence, when all life was good, with its implication of the gradual degeneration from the high and perfect standards of the Golden Age, but with the corollary of Judaism, that that Golden Age would be restored at the end of time.³ With this new content the creation story, like the deity which it had first pictured, ceased to be cold, distant, and lifeless; it came close to the heart of the people, with a message of goodness, faith, hope, devotion, and loyal and punctilious observance, that must have warmed and cheered the hearts of the people then, just as it has ever since.

¹ Cf. Isa. 40:22, 26, 28; 42:5; 44:24; 45:7, 18; Jer. 31:35; Amos 4:13.

² Cf. the thought of the closely related Ps. 8.

³ Gunkel, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

Possibly not without significance is the fact that the Sabbath is represented, not as a day of positive worship and of offering sacrifices, but merely of abstention from work. Not the priestly, sacrificial, Sabbath ritual, such as is prescribed in Num. 28:9 f. is enjoined, which must have centered in the Temple, but the folk-observance of freedom from toil, of resting, with its probable corollary of gatherings of the people for various kinds of observance, among other things, in all likelihood, assemblies in the synagogues for prayer and the reading of the Law. We know that already in the Greek period an anti-priestly folk-movement had begun, which crystallized eventually in the opposed Pharisee and Sadducee parties.¹ Whether this beginning had been made already by the last half of the fifth century B.C., or even by the beginning of the fourth century, and whether this revision of the original priestly creation story, from the standpoint and in the interests of the people at large, was the product of this tendency, while by no means impossible, cannot be affirmed with certainty. But it is, at least, an attractive hypothesis.

Equally attractive is the hypothesis that these redactors of the creation story in the spirit of the people at large were the men who edited JED with P. Certainly Gen. 2:4 is the work of RJEDP, and equally certainly the picture of the deity in the secondary, Sabbath portions of the priestly creation story is strikingly similar to that of the Yahwist creation story in Gen. 2. Moreover, the singular אֱלֹהִים in 1:27a β implies that אֱלֹהִים was regarded as a proper name, just as in Gen. 2-4 (J) and in 5:3 (P2[?]). Scholars have frequently commented upon the fact that in many respects the style of many unmistakably secondary portions of the Priestly Code is more strikingly similar to JE than to P.² This will not by any means hold true of all secondary portions of the Priestly Code; for example, the secondary portions of Lev. 16, instituting Yom Kippur on the 10th day of the 7th month, and fixing the sacrificial ritual for this day, supplementary to the procedure with the two goats, the original New Year sacrifice,³ is manifestly priestly in

¹ Cf. Lauterbach, "Sadducees and Pharisees," in *Studies in Jewish Literature in Honor of Kaufman Kohler*, 1913, pp. 176-98.

² Cf. Carpenter and Harford, *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 298.

³ Cf. my article, "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals," *op. cit.*

content and literary form. Nevertheless it may well be that the editing of JED with P took place in just this period after 400 B.C., and was the work of the same school of writers who revised the original priestly creation story in the interests of the people at large. Familiar with the JED writings, and largely sympathetic with their spirit, they were in all likelihood almost as greatly influenced thereby in thought and style as by the prevailing priestly thought and mode of writing of their own day. All this, however, is advanced as a very attractive and by no means improbable hypothesis, which must, nevertheless, be tested repeatedly in future investigations and from various points of approach before it can be adequately affirmed or refuted.

Even after this first and most thoroughgoing revision, the text of the creation story was for some time in an indetermined, fluid state, and various insertions of minor character were made, such as 1:2a β and *b*, the supposedly scientific classifications of 1:11, 12, 21, 25, and 29, the secondary portions of 1:14, 15, and 16, the reference to the תנינים in 1:21, 28*b*, etc. The additional and variant readings of LXX and Sam. are less likely the result of textual corruption than of individual revision and glossation of various manuscripts from which these versions were made. For a time the text of Gen. 1, as well as of the entire Torah, must have varied somewhat in minor details in different manuscripts, until eventually an official, approved, and accepted text was fixed by the authorities of the time, presumably the Soferim or the Great Synod. In this way the creation story in Gen. 1—2:4 came into being in practically its present form in the Masoretic Text.